

Serial No.: 10/611,509  
Docket No.: 60655.1300

## REMARKS

Applicants reply to the Office Action dated April 17, 2006, within two months. Thus, Applicants request an Advisory Action, if necessary. Claims 6-15 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 6-15. Applicants cancel claim 7 and 8 without prejudice to filing one or more claims having similar subject matter. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 6 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over Liaguno et al., U.S. Patent No 5,729,741 ("Liaguno") in view of Ky, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0130843 ("Ky"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Liaguno generally discloses a system for storing various forms of media along with transcriptions. The transcriptions enable a user to search for phrases or keywords within the transcript in order to locate pertinent audio, video or document scans. Liaguno is limited to the use of optical character recognition (OCR) to create a textual version of a scanned document. Liaguno is also limited to utilizing voice recognition (VR) technology to create textual transcripts of audio and video content. The transcribed documents, audio portion and video portion are stored with their respective digitized format within a computer memory structure.

The Examiner correctly notes that "Liaguno does not expressly disclose converting 'each binary set of said binary content' directly into 'each corresponding ASCII value' to form text content as claimed" (page 3, paragraph 6). The Examiner asserts that "Ky discloses a system and method similar to that of Liaguno, wherein binary content is converted to text content" as claimed (page 3, paragraph 7).

Ky generally discloses a system for converting digital data representing speech to text. Specifically, the Ky system accepts digitized speech input in the form of binary data, searches a library for a matching digital representation of the input, determines the number of syllables in the digital representation, and converts the matching binary representation to an ASCII representation. A transcription management system facilitates saving the ASCII representation within a database as a transcription report. The transcription management system further facilitates distribution of the transcription report to a user via download, email, facsimile, etc.

Both Liaguno and Ky disclose systems for converting digital data to textual transcripts. The Liaguno and Ky system further include a mechanism for saving such transcripts to memory; however,

AXP No. TH200314099  
1843944.1

Serial No.: 10/611,509  
Docket No.: 60655.1300

neither disclose storing both the binary data and the ASCII representation of the Binary file in appropriately configured database fields within the same record. As such, neither Liaguno, Ky, nor any combination thereof, disclose or suggest at least, "storing said binary content within a binary large object field of said record, wherein said binary content does not contain searchable text; converting each binary set of said binary content directly into each corresponding ASCII value to form text content," and "storing said text content within a character large object field of said record," as recited by independent claim 6.

Remaining claims 9-15 variously depend from independent claim 6, therefore dependent claims 9-15 are differentiated from the cited reference for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as in view of their own respective features.

The Examiner rejects claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liaguno in view of Ky as applied to claim 6, and further in view of Anderson, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,799,310 ("Anderson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants have canceled claims 7 and 8, while adding similar elements to independent claim 6. Therefore, Applicants have considered the Examiner's rejection of claims 7 and 8 and present the following arguments as they now apply to independent claim 6.

The Examiner correctly notes that "Liaguno does not explicitly store said binary content as a binary large object (BLOB) or said text content as a character large object (CLOB) as claimed" (page 5, item 4). The Examiner asserts that "Anderson discloses a system and method similar to that of Liaguno, wherein binary content is stored as a BLOB in one field of a database record, while corresponding text content is stored as a CLOB in another field of the database" (page 5, item 4).

Anderson discloses extenders for a relational database, wherein the extenders comprise dedicated table columns for describing and relating complex objects. Anderson generally discloses storing a BLOB in a hidden table field or providing a reference within a table field that point to a BLOB file. The Anderson database includes columns for various data types in addition to the column for a BLOB data type which may store complex media content, such as audio and video (see, Fig 7A-7D).

In addition to the BLOB field, Anderson discloses an index field for storing a description of the BLOB data in order to enable a user to search for media content by keyword. For example, a user of the Anderson system may create a new record to store a video clip of highlights from a basketball game. The user may then compose a description of the video clip including team names, date of the game, location, scores, play-by-play commentary, etc. Subsequently, another user may search for the

AXP No. TH200314099  
1843944.1

Serial No.: 10/611,509  
Docket No.: 60655.1300

video clip by entering a search keyword or phrase. According to Anderson, "[t]he text 714 column (plus its index column 710) provides a means of locating desired images by their text description" (column 9, lines 55-58). Thus, the index field of Anderson is not a textual translation of the corresponding BLOB content, and therefore a search based on the actual audio portion of the media clip would not be possible. As such, neither Liaguno, Ky, Anderson, nor any combination thereof, disclose or suggest at least, "storing said binary content within a binary large object field of said record, wherein said binary content does not contain searchable text; converting each binary set of said binary content directly into each corresponding ASCII value to form text content," and "storing said text content within a character large object field of said record," as recited by independent claim 6, which now incorporates similar elements as disclosed in claims 7 and 8.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. Applicants invite the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 19, 2006

By: 

Howard Sobelman  
Reg. No. 39,038

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**  
400 E. Van Buren  
One Arizona Center  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
Phone: 602-382-6228  
Fax: 602-382-6070  
Email: [hsobelman@swlaw.com](mailto:hsobelman@swlaw.com)